



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,074	01/31/2002	Lloyd Mervyn Davis	D5453-00096	2489

7590
Richard T. Redano
Duane Morris LLP
Suite 500
One Greenway Plaza
Houston, TX 77046

03/15/2004

EXAMINER

FORMAN, BETTY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,074

Applicant(s)

DAVIS, LLOYD MERVYN

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to papers filed 22 December 2003 in which claims 1, 8, 10, 13 and 15 were amended and the specification on pages 1 and 8 was amended. All of the amendments have been thoroughly reviewed and entered.

The previous rejections in the Office Action dated 22 July 2003 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are withdrawn in view of the amendments. The previous rejection under obviousness-type double patenting is withdrawn in view of the fact that the conflicting application has been abandoned.

The previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are maintained. All of the arguments have been thoroughly reviewed and are discussed below.

Claims 1-16 are under prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1634

3. Claims 1-4, 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quake et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0025529 A1 which is a divisional of 09/707,737 filed 6 November 2000).

Regarding Claim 1, Quake et al disclose a method for detecting labeled molecules that have participated in a chemical reaction and that have become temporarily supported at the site of reagent (i.e. polymerase in the presence of primer hybridized to immobilized template wherein both the polymerase and primer are temporarily supported, ¶ 176-181) the method comprising providing a flow cell, providing within the flow cell a solid support having a surface, supporting at least one reagent molecule to the surface (¶ 148) introducing at least two flowing solutions in to the flow cell wherein at least one solution comprises a labeled molecule and at least one solution comprises a buffer (¶ 177-178) wherein the two solutions are at different locations at any time i.e. the solution containing the label is introduced followed by the wash solution to remove unbound label (¶ 11 ¶ 178 and Claim 5) directing the flowing solutions with respect to the supported reagents to immerse the supported reagent in the solution comprising buffer, providing a light source and a detector, substantially simultaneously with step f) switching the detector (i.e. scan with the scanner) to cause the labeled molecule to pass through the illumination zone and detecting light emitted at the illumination zone (¶ 201-206).

Regarding Claim 2, Quake et al disclose the method wherein a single labeled molecule is detected by the step of detecting light emitted from the illumination zone (¶ 199).

Regarding Claim 3, Quake et al disclose the method wherein a chemical reaction is detected by detecting the presence of labeled molecules that have participated in the reaction i.e. labeled nucleotides (¶ 178, 193 and 199).

Regarding Claim 4, Quake et al disclose the method wherein a single chemical reaction is detected by detecting the presence of a single labeled molecule (i.e. labeled nucleotide) that has participated in the reaction by detecting light emitted from the illumination zone (¶ 178, 193, 199 and 218).

Art Unit: 1634

Regarding Claim 9, Quake et al disclose the method wherein the label is fluorescent (§ 181-182).

Regarding Claim 10, Quake et al disclose the method wherein the supported reagent comprises a supported nucleic acid and a polymerase and the solution of labeled molecules comprises at least one fluorescently labeled NTP with no quenching moiety (§ 178, 181 and 191).

Regarding Claim 11, Quake et al disclose the method wherein fluorescent labels are attached to the beta or gamma phosphate of the NTP i.e. pyrophosphate (containing the beta and gamma phosphates) is detected to detect NTP incorporation (§ 212).

Regarding Claim 12, Quake et al disclose the method wherein two or more distinguishable labels are used to label two or more different types of molecules i.e. a different label for each type of nucleotide (§ 181).

Regarding Claim 13, Quake et al disclose the method wherein optical detection includes identifying labels by their property e.g. excitation light, emission light, fluorescent lifetime and location of detection (§ 199 and 202-204).

Regarding Claim 14, Quake et al disclose the method wherein an array of supported reagents (i.e. two-dimensional substrate with localized positions) and optical detections are separately accomplished for each reagent (§ 47, 132 and 204).

Regarding Claim 15, Quake et al disclose the method of claim 3 wherein a series of reactions is detected by repeating the method steps of Claim 1 (§ 9-11).

Regarding Claim 16, Quake et al disclose the method wherein the time interval between successive reactions is controlled by controlling time between successive repetitions (§ 223-229).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant states that Quake teaches use of a scanner system (which Applicant asserts, “is a slow process”). Applicant argues that Quake does not teach synchronization of the read

Art Unit: 1634

out of the optical signal with introduction of the wash solution and therefore does not teach the claimed “substantially simultaneously” detection and wash.

The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive. The courts have stated that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969); and *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (see MPEP 2111). The claimed “substantially simultaneously” is given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the broad claim language and specification wherein “substantially simultaneously” is not defined. Substantially is a relative term that broadens the temporal meaning of simultaneously such that the claimed detection and wash are not required to be simultaneous, but instead within some other broader and undefined time frame.

Quake specifically teaches their method wherein “the template is washed to remove any unincorporated label and the presence of any incorporated label is determined” (§ 178). This embodiment wherein the washing and detecting are taught within a single sentence clearly teaches “substantially simultaneously” washing and detecting. Quake provides further examples of “substantially simultaneously” washing and detecting wherein label incorporation is detected “in the wash stream” (§ 212). Furthermore, Quake teaches that their method “increases the speed” of analysis by reducing time for exchanging reagents and between different steps which clearly suggests “substantially simultaneously” washing and detecting as claimed. Hence, given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed “substantially simultaneously” washing and detecting in view of the embodiment of Quake wherein the step of washing and detecting are taught within a single sentence, Quake teaches the broadly claimed “substantially simultaneously” washing and detecting.

Art Unit: 1634

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,255,083, filed 13 December 1999).

Regarding Claim 1, Williams discloses a method for detecting labeled molecules that have participated in a chemical reaction and that have become temporarily supported at the site of reagent (i.e. polymerase in the presence of primer hybridized to immobilized template wherein both the polymerase and primer are temporarily supported, Column 13, lines 40-60) the method comprising providing a flow cell, providing within the flow cell a solid support having a surface, supporting at least one reagent molecule to the surface introducing at least two flowing solutions in to the flow cell wherein at least one solution comprises a labeled molecule and at least one solution comprises a buffer wherein the two solutions are at different locations at any time i.e. the solution containing the label is introduced followed by the wash solution to remove unbound label directing the flowing solutions with respect to the supported reagents to immerse the supported reagent in the solution comprising buffer, providing a light source and a detector, substantially simultaneously with step f) switching the detector (i.e. scan with the scanner) to cause the labeled molecule to pass through the illumination zone and detecting light emitted at the illumination zone (Column 2, line 17-Column 3, line 10 and Example 2, Column 14, line 61-Column 15, line 26).

Regarding Claim 2, Williams discloses the method wherein a single labeled molecule is detected by the step of detecting light emitted from the illumination zone (Example 2, Column 14, line 61-Column 15, line 26).

Regarding Claim 3, Williams discloses the method wherein a chemical reaction is detected by detecting the presence of labeled molecules that have participated in the reaction i.e. labeled nucleotides (Column 2, line 17-Column 3, line 10).

Regarding Claim 4, Williams discloses the method wherein a single chemical reaction is detected by detecting the presence of a single labeled molecules that has participated in the

Art Unit: 1634

reaction by detecting light emitted from the illumination zone (Example 2, Column 14, line 61-Column 15, line 26).

Regarding Claims 5-8, Williams discloses the method wherein the concentration of the labeled molecules is above 10^{-5}M (Example 4, Column 17, lines 49-51).

Regarding Claim 9, Williams discloses the method wherein the label is fluorescent (Example 2, Column 15, lines 5-15).

Regarding Claim 10, Williams discloses the method wherein the supported reagent comprises a supported polymerase and a nucleic acid and the solution of labeled molecules comprises at least one fluorescently labeled NTP with no quenching moiety (Fig. 4, Column 13, lines 40-49 and Examples 1-2, Column 14, line 22-Column 15, line 15).

Regarding Claim 11, Williams discloses the method wherein fluorescent labels are attached to the gamma phosphate of the NTP (Column 2, lines 37-40).

Regarding Claim 12, Williams discloses the method wherein two or more distinguishable labels are used to label two or more different types of molecules i.e. a different label for each type of nucleotide (Column 2, lines 37-40 and Example 2, Column 14, line 62-Column 15, line 15).

Regarding Claim 13, Williams discloses the method wherein optical detection includes identifying labels by their property e.g. excitation light, emission light and location of detection (Column 15, lines 5-15).

Regarding Claim 14, Williams discloses the method wherein an array of supported reagents and optical detections are separately accomplished for each reagent (Column 4, lines 47-50 and Column 15, lines 5-15).

Regarding Claim 15, Williams discloses the method of claim 3 wherein a series of reactions is detected by repeating the method steps of Claim 1 (Example 2, Column 14, line 62-Column 15, line 26).

Art Unit: 1634

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant states that the claims, as amended overcome the above rejection. However, Applicant provides no specific arguments regarding the teaching of Williams. The rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quake et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0025529 A1 which is a divisional of 09/707,737 filed 6 November 2000) in view of Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,255,083, filed 13 December 1999).

Regarding Claims 5-8, Quake et al disclose a method for detecting labeled molecules that have participated in a chemical reaction the method comprising providing a flow cell, providing within the flow cell a solid support having a surface, supporting at least one reagent molecule to the surface (¶ 148) introducing at least two flowing solutions in to the flow cell wherein at least one solution comprises a labeled molecule and at least one solution comprises a buffer (¶ 177-178) wherein the two solutions are at different locations at any time i.e. the solution containing the label is introduced followed by the wash solution to remove unbound label (¶ 11, ¶ 178 and Claim 5) directing the flowing solutions with respect to the supported

Art Unit: 1634

reagents to immerse the supported reagent in the solution comprising buffer, providing a light source and a detector, substantially simultaneously with step f) switching the detector (i.e. scan with the scanner) to cause the labeled molecule to pass through the illumination zone and detecting light emitted at the illumination zone (§ 201-206). Quake et al is silent regarding the concentration of the labeled molecules. However, labeled molecule concentrations above 10^{-5}M were well known and routinely practiced in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Williams (Example 4, Column 17, lines 43-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the labeled molecule concentration of Quake et al to obtain concentrations above 10^{-5}M as instantly claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilized routine experimentation to thereby derive the instantly claimed concentrations for the expected benefits of optimizing labeled molecule concentrations and maximizing experimental conditions.

It is noted that *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456, 105 USPQ 233,235 states where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum by routine experimentation.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant argues that Quake nor Williams teach detecting the presence of a single labeled molecule that has participated in the reaction by detecting light emitted at an illumination zone wherein the concentration of the label molecules is above 10^{-8}M . The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because, as stated above, Quake clearly teaches the method of Claim as claimed, but are silent regarding the concentration of the labeled molecules. However, the claimed concentration was well known in the art and the courts have stated that it is not inventive to optimize experimental conditions when the general conditions are known *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456, 105 USPQ 233,235. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, using routine experimentation and known

Art Unit: 1634

concentrations taught by Williams, to adjust the concentration of the labeled molecules to thereby optimize experimental conditions.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

11. No claim is allowed.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (703) 306-5878. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 TO 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



BJ Forman, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1634
March 12, 2004